

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA**

United States of America,

Case No. 22-cr-224 (NEB/TNL)

Plaintiff,

v.

**SECOND AMENDED
ARRAIGNMENT NOTICE &
CASE MANAGEMENT ORDER**

Qamar Ahmed Hassan *et al.*,

Defendants.

Counsel for all parties are instructed to review this Order carefully and in its entirety as it represents a significant deviation from the schedules that ordinarily govern criminal cases in the District of Minnesota.

This matter comes before the Court on Defendant Filsan Mumin Hassan's Motion for Extension of Time to File Pretrial Motions, ECF No. 130; Defendant Qamar Ahmed Hassan's Request to Join Motion for Extension of Time to File Pretrial Motions, ECF No. 131; and Defendant Guhaad Hashi Said's Motion to Continue Deadlines in Pretrial Scheduling Order, ECF No. 132. This matter was previously designated complex under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii). *See generally* ECF No. 69.

Defendant Filsan Mumin Hassan moves for "additional time to make defense disclosures and submit pretrial motions." ECF No. 130 at 1. Defendant Filsan Mumin Hassan states that while her "[c]ounsel has made diligent efforts to review, organize and analyze . . . [the discovery in this case]," her counsel needs additional time due to the

volume and complexity of the Government’s disclosures as well as “to investigate and gather materials.” ECF No. 130 at 1. Defendant Filsan Mumin Hassan further states that, on April 28, 2023, the Government produced additional disclosures “in the form of reports and thousands of pages of banking records.” ECF No. 130 at 1. Defendant Filsan Mumin Hassan requests this extension on behalf of herself and her co-defendants, who join in her motion. ECF No. 130 at 1. Defendants Qamar Ahmed Hassan and Guhaad Hashi Said have filed motions expressly joining in Defendant Filsan Mumin Hassan’s motion. *See generally* ECF Nos. 131, 132.

In the Court’s prior First Amended Arraignment Notice & Case Management Order, the Court stated that “any response to . . . a [party’s] request [to modify the schedule] shall be filed within three days.” ECF No. 121 at 6. Defendants Filsan Mumin Hassan, Qamar Ahmed Hassan, and Guhaad Hashi Said’s motions were filed on May 8, 2023. No responses have been filed.¹

Bearing in mind the complexity of this case, the voluminous discovery, the absence of any objection to the requested continuance, and the recent disclosures by the Government, the Court finds pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h) that the ends of justice served by granting a continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and Defendants in a speedy trial and such continuance is necessary to provide Defendants and their counsel reasonable time necessary for effective preparation and to make efficient use of the parties’

¹ To the extent Defendant Filsan Mumin Hassan’s motion can be read as indicating opposition by the Government to an extension beyond two months, *see* ECF No. 130 at 2, no formal objection was filed by the Government.

resources. Based on the foregoing, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that:

1. Defendant Filsan Mumin Hassan's Motion for Extension of Time to File Pretrial Motions, ECF No. 130, is **GRANTED**.

2. Defendant Qamar Ahmed Hassan's Request to Join Motion for Extension of Time to File Pretrial Motions, ECF No. 131, is **GRANTED**.

3. Defendant Guhaad Hashi Said's Motion to Continue Deadlines in Pretrial Scheduling Order, ECF No. 132, is **GRANTED**.

4. As to Defendants Abdiwahab Ahmed Mohamud and Abdullahe Nur Jesow, an arraignment hearing will be held before the undersigned on **January 17, 2024, at 10:00 a.m.**, in Courtroom 9W, Diana E. Murphy United States Courthouse, 300 South Fourth Street, **MINNEAPOLIS**, Minnesota.

5. To the extent it has not done so already, the Government shall immediately begin to make all disclosures required by Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 16(a) to be completed no later than January 6, 2023. *See* D. Minn. LR 12.1(a)(1). In order to avoid the need for a recess of the motions hearing, the Government is requested to make, by January 6, 2023, all disclosures which will be required by Fed. R. Crim. P. 26.2 and 12(h).

6. Pursuant to the Due Process Protections Act, the Court confirms the Government's obligation to disclose to a defendant all exculpatory evidence—that is, evidence that favors a defendant or casts doubt on the Government's case—as required by *Brady v. Maryland*, 373 U.S. 83 (1963), and its progeny, and orders the Government to do so. Failure to do so in a timely manner may result in consequences, including, but not

limited to, exclusion of evidence, adverse jury instructions, dismissal of charges, contempt proceedings, disciplinary action, or sanctions by the Court.

7. Defendants must make all disclosures required by Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 16(b) as soon as practicable, to be completed no later than **September 1, 2023**.² See D. Minn. LR 12.1(a)(2).

8. This Court previously issued an Order on Pretrial Disclosure & Preservation, ECF No. 80, which “proactively addresse[d] certain non-dispositive motions that are commonly filed in the District of Minnesota, which seek discovery, notice of intent to introduce certain types of evidence, preservation of rough notes, and disclosure of evidence favorable to a defendant under *Brady v. Maryland*, 373 U.S. 83 (1963), and related authorities.” ECF No. 80 at 3. “These motions often seek relief that is already required by the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, Federal Rules of Evidence, and federal law.” ECF No. 80 at 3. “To promote the efficient management of these related cases, the Court issue[d the Order on Pretrial Disclosure & Preservation] to preemptively address such matters without the need for each defendant to file multiple motions on these subjects.” ECF No. 80 at 3. **Before filing any pretrial motions, a party shall consult the prior Order on Pretrial Disclosure & Preservation.**

² As set forth in the First Amended Arraignment Notice & Case Management Order, the deadline for Defendants’ disclosures was April 1, 2023. ECF No. 121 at 3. The instant motions come approximately one month after that deadline. Nevertheless, in light of the Government’s supplemental disclosures at the end of April, the Court finds that Defendants were diligent in seeking an extension of their disclosure deadline and there is good cause to extend that passed deadline in light of the Government’s supplemental disclosures. Further, as noted above, the Government did not respond to Defendants’ motions.

9. All motions in the above-entitled case must be filed and served consistent with Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure 12(b) and 47 on or before **November 9, 2023**.³ *See* D. Minn. LR 12.1(c)(1). Two courtesy copies of all motions and responses must be delivered directly to the chambers of Magistrate Judge Tony N. Leung.⁴

10. **Counsel must electronically file a letter on or before November 9, 2023, if no motions will be filed and there is no need for hearing.**

11. All responses to motions must be filed by **December 22, 2023**. *See* D. Minn. LR 12.1(c)(2).

12. Any Notice of Intent to Call Witnesses must be filed by **December 22, 2023**. *See* D. Minn. LR. 12.1(c)(3)(A).

13. Any Responsive Notice of Intent to Call Witnesses must be filed by **December 29, 2023**. *See* D. Minn. LR 12.1(c)(3)(B).

14. A motions hearing will be held pursuant to Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 12(c) where:

- a. The Government makes timely disclosures and a defendant identifies in the motions particularized matters for which an evidentiary hearing is necessary; or
- b. Oral argument is requested by either party in its motion, objection or response pleadings.

15. If required, the motions hearing must be heard before Magistrate Judge Tony N. Leung on **January 17, 2024, at 10:00 a.m.**, in Courtroom 9W, Diana E. Murphy United

³ “Before filing a motion under Fed. R. Crim. P. 12(b), the moving party must confer with the responding party. The parties must attempt in good faith to clarify and narrow the issues in dispute.” D. Minn. LR 12.1(b).

⁴ U.S. Mail or hand-deliver to 300 South Fourth Street, Suite 9W, Minneapolis, MN 55415.

States Courthouse, 300 South Fourth Street, **MINNEAPOLIS**, Minnesota. *See* D. Minn. LR 12.1(d). **The parties shall be prepared to continue the hearing into January 18, 2024, if necessary.**

16. **TRIAL:**

a. **IF NO PRETRIAL MOTIONS ARE FILED BY A DEFENDANT, the following trial and trial-related dates are:**

All voir dire questions, **motions for counsel to participate in voir dire**, and jury instructions must be submitted to District Judge Nancy E. Brasel on or before **March 4, 2024**.

This case must commence trial on **March 18, 2024, at 9:00 a.m.** before District Judge Nancy E. Brasel in Courtroom 13W, Diana E. Murphy United States Courthouse, 300 South Fourth Street, **MINNEAPOLIS**, Minnesota.

b. **IF PRETRIAL MOTIONS ARE FILED, the trial date, and other related dates, including but not limited to motions for counsel to participate in voir dire, will be rescheduled following the ruling on pretrial motions. Counsel must contact the Courtroom Deputy for District Judge Nancy E. Brasel to confirm the new trial date.**

17. The period of time from **the date of this Order through November 9, 2023**, shall be excluded from Speedy Trial Act computations in this case. *See United States v. Mallett*, 751 F.3d 907, 911 (8th Cir. 2014) (“Exclusions of time attributable to one defendant apply to all codefendants.” (quotation omitted)); *United States v. Arrellano-Garcia*, 471 F.3d 897, 900 (8th Cir. 2006) (same).

18. **Should a party request modification of this schedule, any response to such a request shall be filed within three days.**

19. All prior consistent orders relating to the Indictment remain in full force and effect.

20. Failure to comply with any provision of this Order or any other prior consistent Order shall subject the non-complying party, non-complying counsel and/or the party such counsel represents to any and all appropriate remedies, sanctions and the like.

Date: May 16, 2023

s/ Tony N. Leung
Tony N. Leung
United States Magistrate Judge
District of Minnesota

United States v. Hassan et al.
Case No. 22-cr-224 (NEB/TNL)